REVISED: APRIL 5, 2005

2004-2005 No Child Left Behind - Blue Ribbon Schools Program

U.S. Department of Education

Cover Sheet

Type of School: __ Elementary __ Middle __ High _X_ K-12

Name of Principal Mr. Reed Carlson
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other) (As it should appear in the official records)

Official School Name Kenny Lake School
(As it should appear in the official records)

School Mailing Address Mile 5 Edgerton Highway / HC 60 Box 224
(If address is P.O. Box, also include street address)

Copper Center | Alaska | 99573-9703
City | State | Zip Code+4 (9 digits total)

County N/A School Code Number* 110100

Telephone (907) 822-3870 Fax (907) 822-3794

Website/URL www.kennylakeschool.com E-mail rcarlson@crsd.k12.ak.us

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge all information is accurate.

_____ Date_____
(Principal's Signature)

Name of Superintendent* Dr. James Elliott
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

District Name Copper River School District Tel. (907) 822-3234

I have reviewed the information in this application, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date_____
(Superintendent's Signature)

Name of School Board President/Chairperson Mrs. Beth Betts
(Specify: Ms., Miss, Mrs., Dr., Mr., Other)

I have reviewed the information in this package, including the eligibility requirements on page 2, and certify that to the best of my knowledge it is accurate.

_____ Date_____
(School Board President's/Chairperson's Signature)

**Private Schools: If the information requested is not applicable, write N/A in the space.*

PART I - ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATION

[Include this page in the school's application as page 2.]

The signatures on the first page of this application certify that each of the statements below concerning the school's eligibility and compliance with U.S. Department of Education, Office of Civil Rights (OCR) requirements is true and correct.

1. The school has some configuration that includes grades K-12. (Schools with one principal, even K-12 schools, must apply as an entire school.)

2. The school has not been in school improvement status or been identified by the state as "persistently dangerous" within the last two years. To meet final eligibility, the school must meet the state's adequate yearly progress requirement in the 2004-2005 school year.

3. If the school includes grades 7 or higher, it has foreign language as a part of its core curriculum.

4. The school has been in existence for five full years, that is, from at least September 1999 and has not received the 2003 or 2004 *No Child Left Behind – Blue Ribbon Schools Award.*

5. The nominated school or district is not refusing the OCR access to information necessary to investigate a civil rights complaint or to conduct a district-wide compliance review.

6. The OCR has not issued a violation letter of findings to the school district concluding that the nominated school or the district as a whole has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes. A violation letter of findings will not be considered outstanding if the OCR has accepted a corrective action plan from the district to remedy the violation.

7. The U.S. Department of Justice does not have a pending suit alleging that the nominated school, or the school district as a whole, has violated one or more of the civil rights statutes or the Constitution's equal protection clause.

8. There are no findings of violations of the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act in a U.S. Department of Education monitoring report that apply to the school or school district in question; or if there are such findings, the state or district has corrected, or agreed to correct, the findings.

PART II - DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

All data are the most recent year available.

DISTRICT (Questions 1-2 not applicable to private schools)

1. Number of **schools in the district**:
   - __5__ Elementary schools
   - _____ Middle schools
   - _____ Junior high schools
   - __1__ High schools
   - __1__ Other
   - __7__ TOTAL

2. **District** Per Pupil Expenditure: _____$9,294.00___

   Average **State** Per Pupil Expenditure: ____$8,674.00___

SCHOOL (To be completed by all schools)

3. Category that best describes the area where the **school is located**:

   [ ] Urban or large central city
   [ ] Suburban school with characteristics typical of an urban area
   [ ] Suburban
   [ ] Small city or town in a rural area
   [X] Rural

4. __10__ Number of **years the principal has been in her/his position** at this school.

   _____ If fewer than three years, how long was the previous principal at this school?

5. **Number of students as of October 1** enrolled at each grade level or its equivalent in applying school only:

Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total	Grade	# of Males	# of Females	Grade Total
PreK	1	1	**2**	**7**	6	5	**11**
K	2	5	**7**	**8**	6	6	**12**
1	2	8	**10**	**9**	4	7	**11**
2	5	4	**9**	**10**	4	8	**12**
3	6	5	**11**	**11**	11	9	**20**
4	3	6	**9**	**12**	5	7	**12**
5	3	7	**10**	**Other**			
6	7	4	**11**				
			TOTAL STUDENTS IN THE APPLYING SCHOOL →				**147**

6. **Racial/ethnic composition** of the students in the school:

__72__% White
__1__% Black or African American
__1__% Hispanic or Latino
__1__% Asian/Pacific Islander
__25__% American Indian/Alaskan Native
100% Total

Use only the five standard categories in reporting the racial/ethnic composition of the school.

7. **Student turnover, or mobility rate**, during the past year: __15__%

(This rate should be calculated using the grid below. The answer to (6) is the mobility rate.)

(1)	Number of students who transferred ***to*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	9
(2)	Number of students who transferred ***from*** the school after October 1 until the end of the year.	13
(3)	Subtotal of all transferred students [sum of rows (1) and (2)]	22
(4)	Total number of students in the school as of October 1	147
(5)	Subtotal in row (3) divided by total in row (4)	.15
(6)	Amount in row (5) multiplied by 100	15

8. **Limited English Proficient students** in the school: __0__%
__0__Total Number Limited English Proficient
Number of languages represented: __1__
Specify languages: English

9. **Students eligible for free/reduced-priced meals**: __55__%

Total number students who qualify: __79__

10. **Students receiving special education services**: __16__%
__23__Total Number of Students Served

Indicate below the **number of students with disabilities** according to conditions designated in the Individuals with Disabilities Education Act.

____Autism
____Deafness
____Deaf-Blindness
____Emotional Disturbance
____Hearing Impairment
_1__Mental Retardation
_1__Multiple Disabilities
____Orthopedic Impairment
_2__Other Health Impaired
_5__Specific Learning Disability
_14_Speech or Language Impairment
____Traumatic Brain Injury
____Visual Impairment Including Blindness

11. Indicate **number of full-time and part-time staff members** in each of the categories below:

	Number of Staff	
	Full-time	**Part-Time**
Administrator(s)	1	0
Classroom teachers	9	0
Special resource teachers/specialists	0	2
Paraprofessionals	4	3
Support staff	3	2
Total number	17	7

12. **Average school student-"classroom teacher" ratio**: 15.9 to 1

13. Show the **attendance patterns of teachers and students** as a percentage. The student dropout rate is defined by the state. The student drop-off rate is the difference between the number of entering students and the number of exiting students from the same cohort. (From the same cohort, subtract the number of exiting students from the number of entering students; divide that number by the number of entering students; multiply by 100 to get the percentage drop-off rate.) Briefly explain in 100 words or fewer any major discrepancy between the dropout rate and the drop-off rate. (Only middle and high schools need to supply dropout rates and only high schools need to supply drop-off rates.)

	2003-2004	2002-2003	2001-2002	2000-2001	1999-2000
Daily student attendance	92.1 %	91.8 %	91.8 %	92.6 %	91. 7 %
Daily teacher attendance*	89%	89.8%	89.6%	91.3%	87.3%
Teacher turnover rate	5 %	0 %	0 %	18 %	18 %
Student dropout rate (middle/high)	1.6 %	1.9 %	0 %	1.9 %	1.8 %
Student drop-off rate (high school) **	7%	6%	8%	10%	10%

*Daily teacher attendance determined by dividing number of days worked (including in-service days) by total number of days absent from classroom for *any* reason, including administrative and professional leave days, sick leave, and personal leave.

**Many families call the Copper River School District home during the summer months. As a result, Kenny Lake School has a few students who begin the school year in late August here at KLS and then leave the district to return to a home district for the remainder of the school year, often withdrawing in late September or early October. There is a significant discrepancy between the drop-out rate and the drop-off rate due to this seasonal "migration."

14. Show what the **students who graduated in Spring 2004** are doing as of September 2004.

Graduating class size	8
Enrolled in a 4-year college or university	25 %
Enrolled in vocational training	25 %
Found employment / currently working	50 %
Total	**100** %

PART III - SUMMARY

Situated at the edge of the Wrangell-St. Elias National Park in Southcentral Alaska, Kenny Lake School is among the state's most rural road-system schools. With 140 students, 10 certified staff members, and a support staff of seven, Kenny Lake School serves a K-12 student population drawn from a 30-mile radius. There is a spirit of individualism combined with a sense of commitment to family and community in the Kenny Lake attendance area. Many homes are owner-built, with friends often lending a helping hand during construction. Wells can be very costly, so many families haul their household water from the two community wells. Families hunt, fish, pick berries, and raise a great deal of their food, storing it through the winter (with temperatures often dipping to -50° F) in large freezers and root cellars. The school, library, community hall, and local churches serve as hubs for social activities.

On the first day of each school year, an assembly inspires students, staff, and parents with an annual theme. "Pressing On," the 2004-05 theme, encourages students to "do their best, do what is right, and speak the truth." Following the annual assembly, Marlene Roig—a Kenny Lake homesteader and 30-year veteran of the KLS staff—rings an antique school bell to signify the official start of the first day of school. It is this kind of tradition and commitment to excellence that makes Kenny Lake School such a unique and wonderful place for students, staff, parents, and community members alike.

Along with our mission statement, the school's statements of belief hang in the brightly-lit foyer, framed along with photographs of students, staff, parents, and community members. Kenny Lake School's mission is *to provide a safe atmosphere of support, concern, and acceptance where academic excellence, virtuous character, parental and community involvement, and a life-long love of learning are valued and nurtured.* Our school exists to aide each student in developing his or her maximum potential: intellectually, socially, physically, emotionally, and morally. Teachers have most students for two or more years in combined classes, enabling staff to provide individualized instruction for each and every child. This attention to the *individual* is what truly sets Kenny Lake apart as a school of excellence. The consistency of staff members, combined grade-level classrooms, and close ties between school and community result in individualized learning plans for each and every student—not only on paper, but in the everyday reality of the classroom, as well. Children here are not known by ID numbers, socio-economic status, special education classification, or class rankings; each and every child is known as a unique individual with terrific gifts and talents. This sincere belief in the potential of *every* child is what makes KLS so much more than just a place where students come to learn.

While students at KLS may be isolated in terms of geography, they are not lacking in terms of opportunities to experience activities and a variety of coursework. Interactive television (ITV) links high school students and faculty with district schools and the community college. Students compete in local, district, and statewide Academic Pentathlon and Decathlon, Geography and Spelling Bees, Battle of the Books, oratorical contests, and Native Youth Olympics. A student council, National Honor Society, National Junior Honor Society, and music honor society foster leadership skills and encourage volunteer efforts among students. The school choir, which includes more than half of the students in grades 7-12, competes at regional and state. An itinerant band teacher provides instruction in basic musicianship and a variety of instruments. After-school music lessons help students excel on the piano, violin, and guitar. An annual play or musical draws a standing-room only crowd as students transform the school gymnasium into a cultural center complete with music, poetry readings, book signings, and art displays. History Fairs and Science & Math Expos are held on alternating years to demonstrate and celebrate learning. The majority of students participate in athletics, as well. Youth hockey, volleyball, and basketball programs teach students basic skills and sportsmanship and build team camaraderie from a very young age. At the junior/senior high school levels, students participate in varsity hockey, volleyball, basketball, and baseball, with the school's co-ed ice hockey and baseball teams among the smallest in the state.

Excellence is everything at Kenny Lake School—from learning to read in the primary grades to presenting evidence of readiness for graduation at an annual community pot-luck dinner for seniors. Each and every individual matters, and all of us—staff, students, parents, and community—work together to ensure success.

PART IV – INDICATORS OF ACADEMIC SUCCESS

Alaska's state reporting system describes a student's performance level as Advanced, Proficient, Below Proficient, or Far Below Proficient, as determined by annual performance on a criterion-referenced, standards-based assessment. According to Alaska's standards, a student **proficient** in English language arts (**reading and writing**) is able to speak and write well; competently and thoughtfully read, listen, and view literature and technical materials; identify and select from multiple strategies to complete projects; think logically and reflectively to present and explain positions based on relevant and reliable information; and understand and respect the perspectives of others. According to Alaska's **mathematics** standards, a proficient student is able to understand math facts, concepts, principles, and theories; understand, select, and use a variety of problem-solving strategies; understand and use appropriate methods to define and explain math relationships; use logic and reason to solve math problems; and apply math concepts and processes to situations in and out of school. Students scoring at the **advanced** level demonstrate exceptional ability, while scores falling in the **below proficient** and **far below proficient** ranges indicate students who have not yet mastered requisite skills for a given set of standards.

Kenny Lake School's assessment results clearly illustrate a number of important characteristics. First of all, the emphasis on strong, well-articulated academic programs and consistent staffing are reflected in our assessment scores. As readers and writers, KLS students are highly successful. These key skills are at the forefront of learning in our elementary grades. A consistent approach to literacy instruction and an emphasis on reading and writing across the curriculum continue through junior high and the high school grades. Students and teachers K-12 use a common language with which they talk about reading and writing; this stability and consistency result in deep learning and mastery. In addition, our young mathematicians are supported by the use of a common K-12 math program and substantial support through Title I assistance, tutoring, and small class sizes. In the course of the last few years, a heavy emphasis on "the basics" in literacy and math has made a clear difference in assessment scores, with significant numbers of students school-wide achieving at the advanced level.

One of the most exciting points illustrated by our assessment results is that typically "disadvantaged" students—those categorized in socioeconomic, disability, or minority subgroups—consistently reach high achievement levels, consistently scoring at the advanced and proficient levels. The level of support for each and every student at KLS is huge: the school is here to provide academic support, encouragement, counseling, food, shelter, and safety. Test scores reflect this combination of emphases. For many of our disadvantaged students, school is *much* more than a place where reading, writing, and math happen. Regardless of background, prior experiences, or disabilities, our students are told again and again that they *can* achieve; when provided with appropriate support and constant encouragement, they do indeed perform and succeed academically in ways that sometimes surprise us all.

In addition, there is a direct correlation between a student's test scores and his or her length of enrollment at KLS. In reviewing several years' test scores for all of our students, it quickly becomes clear that those with sporadic attendance have lower scores. Similarly, students who are new to the school often have lower scores than their peers, as well. Students who have been enrolled for at KLS for at least two years are typically quite successful; those who have attended KLS for the majority of their educational careers are overwhelmingly successful on standardized assessments.

Tracking assessment results over a period of years also illustrates that students who qualify for special education services at younger grades are becoming independent learners by the time they are in junior high, making it clear that support services for students with disabilities are effective. All students, even those with severe needs, develop strategies that allow them to be successful at the upper grades.

Please note that our small class sizes result in several subgroups with only one or two students. While a quick glance at a subgroup score showing 50% of students performing below the proficiency level may be alarming, it is important to note that there may be only one student accounting for that 50%. At Kenny Lake School, every "number" is a student with an individualized intervention and support plan. On an annual basis, the KLS staff creates "non-proficiency intervention plans" for students who struggle in school, regardless of where those students perform on standardized assessments. While assessment results offer an academic snapshot of a student's abilities, there is a much larger picture that we address in our educational efforts on a daily basis.

How is assessment data used to understand and improve student and school performance?

Assessment data are much more than just a series of reports at Kenny Lake School. One full day of in-service at beginning of each school year is devoted to the review of our school-wide assessment results and the creation of individualized intervention plans. Each August, we gather as full staff to discuss the needs of each and every student on our K-12 roster. We review academic needs based on test scores and past school performance to make decisions regarding class placement & scheduling, homework support, and tutoring. We address physical needs in terms of classroom accommodations, transportation to and from school and activities, food, clothing, and shelter issues. We plan for students' emotional needs, such as regular visits with the school counselor and alternative placement allowing time/space to cool down. And finally, we consider social needs and plan for mentoring and specific classroom interventions.

Non-proficiency intervention plans are implemented during the first quarter of the school year and reviewed with parents during quarter one conferences. A section of the plan document itself addresses "at home" interventions and support, outlining a home-school partnership to support each student.

Collaborative development of each plan involves *all* teachers working with that student. All teachers are responsible for implementing the plan, as well. Input is also provided by students' past teachers to facilitate smooth transitions from one classroom to the next. Discussions occur as a full staff so that all can contribute and are aware of the progress of every student in the school. Because our staff remains tremendously stable, we believe it is important that all are aware of how each student is developing and what to watch for when we interact with students at all-school assemblies and events.

Students' plans and new assessment data are reviewed at semester time. Again as a large group, we review the progress of *each* student in the school. New students are identified as "on target" or in need of intervention plans. Students with existing plans are reviewed: sometimes it is determined the plan is no longer needed because the student has overcome a specific challenge or hardship; other times revisions are made if the original plan does not seem to be working. If a child who was not identified at the beginning of the year is struggling, a plan is developed for that child. Again, it is the focus on each individual student at Kenny Lake that makes this careful analysis and application of assessment results matter and has ultimately improved both student and school performance.

How does the school communicate student performance to parents, students, and the community?

The principal and staff at KLS take frequent opportunities to share assessment information with students. School-wide writing assessments, state benchmark exams, and national standardized tests are all seen as critical components of students' learning, and students are encouraged to *always* do their best. A school-wide theme each year relates to academic success; as a result of this emphasis on excellence, students value success on formal assessments as much as staff members do. Celebrations to recognize student success include quarterly honors assemblies, ice cream parties, and year-end awards nights.

The school is in regular communication with parents through letters and fliers highlighting ways to help students be successful in school and prepare for assessments. Every three weeks, students and parents receive updated academic progress reports. Teachers also contact parents by phone with progress updates, emphasizing successes in the classroom and at school as well as offering ideas for intervention and support. A critical section of each student intervention plan details home support. If a parent does not attend parent-teacher conferences to review the plan, contact is made by phone and mail until the signed document is returned. It is imperative that parents know specifically how they can support students.

The principal's report at monthly Parent Teacher Organization meetings includes detailed information regarding the school's performance, along with analysis of AYP results, and grade-level and subgroup assessment results. *All* information related to our students' successes and struggles is communicated frequently and clearly. The school sees itself in partnership with parents, community members, and local agencies; thus, it is important that they are aware of the school's performance.

The principal's report in our district newsletter and at district school board meetings highlights student performance at KLS. In addition, our school district & state publish a report card to the public, making KLS's performance details available to a wider audience.

We believe very strongly that making students, parents, and community members aware of the standards, the grade-level expectations, and our students' goals as learners is key to academic success. At all grade levels, in all content areas, students are aware of the target and are involved in assessing their

own progress through portfolios, self-assessments, etc. Because they are aware, they are motivated to succeed. Constant encouragement and support help every student at KLS to believe in him or herself…and to realize that success is a possibility.

Describe how the school has shared and will continue to share its successes with other schools.

Nearly all members of the KLS teaching staff are involved in a variety of professional endeavors related to district curriculum development and training. From our teaching staff of nine, two teachers serve on the Language Arts committee, two are on the curriculum review committee, and two hold positions on the technology committee—during the 2004-05 school year alone. In addition, teachers from Kenny Lake are frequently called upon to provide a variety of trainings for other staff in the CRSD.

Our teachers attend professional conferences on the state, regional, and national levels and present best practices developed at Kenny Lake, using KLS student work as exemplars. Staff members hold memberships and offices in state and national educational organizations; the vast majority hold masters degrees; and a few serve on statewide committees and panels. The successes we experience in our classrooms and with our students are shared through professional writing in journal and newspaper articles, presentations at conferences and meetings, and through professional courses taken, taught and/or facilitated by KLS staff members. Participation in active state and national consortiums and education networks allows the school and its staff to share successes and continually analyze, plan, and implement strategies for improving teaching and learning.

From time to time, KLS teachers make site visits to other schools in the CRSD and elsewhere in Alaska to mentor colleagues and demonstrate best practices. Our school and district administration strongly believes that working together (with teachers-teaching-teachers) and sharing expertise will improve not only our own teachers' sense of professionalism, but will also enhance learning in our classrooms here at Kenny Lake and across the district and state. In addition, teachers from other schools and districts occasionally visit KLS to observe, ask questions, interact with students, and glean strategies for their own schools and classrooms.

PART V – CURRICULUM AND INSTRUCTION *Describe the school's curriculum.*

Reading: Years of experience in teaching young children to read combined with research and best practice create a highly effective reading program for students in grades K-3. The vast majority of KLS students are successful readers by the time they enter fourth grade. A heavy emphasis on the development of critical skills in grades 4/5 prepares students for more intensive demands as readers in middle and upper grades. Middle/high school courses focus on critical and analytical reading of a variety of genres. A committed library aide knows students and is able to hand-select appropriate material for each reader.

Writing: KLS's K-12 staff utilizes Six Trait analytical strategies and assessment to teach writing. Substantial training related to the Six Trait approach provides our entire K-12 staff, including paraprofessionals, with a common language for the teaching and assessment of student writing. Consistency in staff and a commitment to excellence in writing across the curriculum continues to be of great importance. Teachers share strategies within the building and at in-service trainings. We conduct an annual writing assessment as a school, including all staff members in the scoring process, allowing us to review a writing sample from each and every student; this information is then used to develop an appropriate focus for grade-level and content-area writing emphases.

Math: Saxon math has been used as the primary math curriculum material in grades K-12 for the last several years. Teachers continue to supplement with experience-based best practices and technology. Math labs involve real-life application problems. Excellence in teaching and consistency of materials and approach across grades combine to provide students with strong math skills. Math-savvy support staff assists struggling students with individual tutoring, allowing them to make acceptable progress each year. New students are tested upon enrollment so they can be appropriately placed in math classes with frequent review of placements to ensure students opportunities to learn and progress each year.

Science: Study of the sciences is strongly supported by our geographic location—visits to hatchery, salmon project, hikes to bluff with local geologists, and easy access to a national park right make learning about sciences a practical experience. During alternating years, students participate in a Science & Math

Expo, a community event at which students show what they have learned, develop and conduct special experiments, teach math games, involve young children and adults in simple labs, etc. Technology is an important element in science curriculum and allows virtual dissection and field trips, for example, making it possible for students to participate in activities for which we don't have funds or resources.

History / Social Studies: While students are able to focus on social studies as primary areas of inquiry at the various grade levels, the study of society, history, culture is an important cross-curricular focus from kindergarten through grade 12. Combined with the reading and study of particular texts, inquiry units, and technology projects, students learn about social studies topics through real-life applications. Local history & culture components of the curriculum, with speakers invited in on regular basis to tell stories, share artifacts, etc. Online exchanges partner students from KLS with peers in other parts of the state, nation, and world for conversations about cultural, social, and historical topics.

Foreign Language: Spanish (our district-selected foreign language) is offered annually via Interactive Television, with a few exceptions based on student schedules and demand. Beginning next year, KLS will implement the Rosetta Stone foreign language program, incorporating online and video-supported learning with an on-site Spanish teacher. Elementary students learn Spanish in conjunction with their weekly studies. In the past several years, many exchange students have attended Kenny Lake School, providing exposure to various foreign languages; this year alone, Kenny Lake families are hosting four exchange students from Germany, Spain, and Korea.

Fine Arts: At least two fine arts courses—including vocal and instrumental music, visual arts, and drama—are offered annually. A tremendously strong arts program exists in elementary classrooms thanks to community volunteers. An annual dramatic production involves the majority of high school students; an instrumental music program is led by an itinerant district music teacher; and our vocal music program has grown substantially over the last several years, currently including half of our 7-12 grade students

Technology and Vo-Tech Programs: Beginning in kindergarten, students begin learning with and about technology. We believe that technology can support and enhance learning across grades and content areas. Computers are used as tools for writing beginning in early grades, with keyboarding beginning in K-1. Jr/Sr high school students participate in a statewide digital filmmaking contest and demonstrate learning via technology projects such as web sites, PowerPoints, digital movies, digitally produced radio plays, etc. Technology-specific courses include computer graphics, computer assisted drafting, computer business applications. In addition, vocational-technical offerings include small engines and industrial arts.

Physical Education: P.E. is required of all students in grades K-8 and is an elective offering for high school students. P.E. classes feature a variety of games, sports, weight lifting, cross-country skiing, and other activities. KLS participates in the Presidential Physical Fitness program with many students achieving National & Presidential each year. Students participate in a variety of sports, such as elementary, junior high, and varsity volleyball and basketball; co-ed varsity ice hockey team. After-school USA hockey teams are supported by school, with students able to borrow gear and use free ice time.

Describe the elementary school's reading curriculum, including a description of why the school chose this particular approach to reading.

It is nearly impossible to describe our elementary school's reading program without talking about our writing program, as well: Kenny Lake School views reading as writing and two halves of the literacy whole. In grades K-3, students become readers through a balanced instructional approach that combines phonics with guided reading, small and large group instruction, skills-based support and enrichment, and individual tutoring. Because of KLS's combined-grade classrooms, our K-1 and 2nd/3rd grade teachers are able to closely monitor and support individual readers in the primary grades. By the time students reach the 4th/5th grade classroom, the vast majority are successful readers at grade level or above. An emphasis on reading for enjoyment is emphasized in grades four and five, with students developing avid reading behaviors. For those students who continue to struggle with literacy skills, individual tutoring and small-group support is available. In sixth grade, the focus expands to encompass a greater emphasis on reading and writing to learn. Content-area reading in science, geography, history, and literature helps students develop the skills they will need in jr/sr high coursework. In addition to nearly a century of combined classroom experience, all five certified staff members who work with elementary readers have extensive Lindamood Bell training, and two staff members have done graduate-level work specific to the

development of balanced reading programs.

Reading to learn and reading for enjoyment are valued in our K-6 program. Our elementary students participate annually in the Battle of the Books competition, with two of this year's three teams winning district-level competitions. Parent and community volunteers generously donate time to advise Battle of the Books teams and to work as volunteer reading mentors with our students. Reading at Kenny Lake is "cool," and our students understand the critical importance of literacy.

Describe the secondary school's English language curriculum, including efforts the school makes to improve the reading skills of students who read below grade level.

A variety of language arts courses for students in grades 7-12 provide students with intensive opportunities to master basic skills and hone abilities as readers and writers. Both the reading and writing strands of the LA curriculum are firmly rooted in application-based experiences. In order for students to become more competent readers, they must read; to become effective writers, they must write. The discreet skills necessary for mastery of these tasks are important, but so is an overarching appreciation for the power of literacy.

Junior-high language arts classes serve as a bridge between elementary classrooms and the demands of high school course work. The two teachers responsible for LA instruction in grades 6, 7, and 8 work closely to identify individual and group needs in the content area, providing focused instruction to close learning gaps and strengthen individual skills.

Mixed grade-level course offerings meet the needs of various learners in grades 9-12. Standards English, English LA 9-12, and Honors English provide appropriate instruction and challenge for students of all ability levels. Students reading below grade level receive individualized attention in the Standards English class and benefit from small reading groups. A variety of research-based approaches to improving reading skills of older students are utilized, selected specifically for each individual student. The honors-level class is the largest high school English class this year, with many students categorized as disadvantaged accepting the challenge of this difficult coursework.

Students in all secondary English classes encounter a variety of texts and genres in the course of a school year. The daily annotation of poetry and other short texts helps students develop critical thinking skills as they read. Students annually submit a number of pieces of writing to contests and publications. For five consecutive years, KLS has published an anthology of student writing featuring writing by all students in grades 8-12 and several elementary students. Students present a community poetry reading and book signing each spring, elevating their confidence in themselves as real writers.

Describe one other curriculum area of the school's choice and show how it relates to essential skills and knowledge based on the school's mission.

In the spring of 2001, Kenny Lake School completed a year-long accreditation process. In the course of our school-wide accreditation project, a number of areas needing improvement were identified. Technology was one of those areas. Specifically, we determined that KLS needed to expand its use of technology as a tool for teaching and learning. As a direct result, all ten certified staff members worked together to write a successful grant proposal for a $200,000 Technology Advancement Grant. During the 2001-02 school year, this grant funded the "CABLE" Project, allowing staff members to engage in school-wide action research endeavor. As a staff, we decided to focus our efforts on current education-related brain research and its implications for the effective, efficient integration of technology in classroom learning environments.

In the course of this initial year of focus, KLS students became amazing savvy technology users—not merely because the bells and whistles appealed to them, but because they discovered new ways to demonstrate what they were learning to wider audiences. An increase in responsible technology integration in the classroom exposed our students to a variety of unique learning experiences including content-specific online conferences with students in other villages, regions, and states. Students of all ages learned the value of technology as a source of information (especially important in a small, rural community without access to a large library) and began to use the computer and portable keyboards as preferred writing instruments. Teachers developed websites to share assignments and resources, post announcements, and maintain regular contact with parents and community members. Classroom research

projects initiated by the staff participants spanned the school year and concluded in a formal publication documenting the CABLE project and the new understandings that resulted from it.

Technology continues to be an important part of daily teaching and learning at KLS. Students and teachers have learned the value of technology as a *tool* for learning, but they are also able to clearly articulate the steps essential in a successful technology-based learning endeavor. Technology continues to meet the needs of many of our at-risk students by providing them with new ways to express themselves and demonstrate their mastery of required skills.

Describe the different instructional methods the school uses to improve student learning.

Kenny Lake School's small size and focus on individualized instruction necessitates differentiated instruction across the board. At every grade level and in every content area, teachers are attuned to "what works" for individual students. Staff members know the students well, and instruction strategies and approaches are modified accordingly for each child. Stability in our teaching and paraprofessional staff results in a *community* of teachers and learners: staff members know where each student is academically at the beginning of each year, and they know first-hand how far each child has progressed by the time the final bell rings in May. This sincere understanding of each student's skills, abilities, and *personality* allows individual staff members and the school as a whole to provide instruction that "fits."

As part of our 2001-02 grant-funded technology project, staff members read a number of texts focusing on learning styles, types of learners, and appropriate instructional approaches various types of students. From Howard Gardner's *Multiple Intelligences in the Classroom* to Robert Sylwester's *A Celebration of Neurons,* KLS staff read, discussed, and considered the implications of consciously differentiating instruction in our school. This research, combined with our experience-based understanding of students in our school community, had a profound effect. Teachers now implement "brain gym" activities in the elementary grades, integrate classical music into study and writing sessions in the high school classrooms, and work together with students to determine individual learning styles in all grades. Teachers continue to incorporate a wide variety of instructional methods daily lessons and quarterly planning, keeping not only the various types of learners in mind, but also the *specific* learners who fill the desks in our classrooms each day.

We believe that our students' achievement levels and school performance as a whole is in large part a result of this research-based attention to differentiated instruction and student-specific approaches to teaching and learning.

Describe the professional development program and its impact on improving student achievement.

The district superintendent, building principal, and all involved staff members at Kenny Lake firmly believe that all in-service training and district-sponsored professional development should directly impact student learning and achievement. At the district level, one in-service day is set aside at the beginning of each school year to review assessment results, examine demographics, and make recommendations and instructional decisions based on assessment data. At KLS, two full in-service days this year were devoted to the development of non-proficiency intervention plans for students; one full in-service day was reserved for the scoring of K-12 analytic writing assessments; and three additional days focus on site-based trainings that focus on specific needs of teachers, students, and the school. Past trainings have included technology integration, use of online coursework and web-based supplementary materials, and teaching strategies.

Individual staff members have the option to set personal goals on alternating years in lieu of formal classroom evaluations. Opportunities to set and pursue goals have become popular among staff members because they address specific needs and interests within classrooms and the school as a whole. Recent staff-selected goals have included the development of a reading strategies program, completion of the National Board Certification portfolio process, production of a community "History Fair," implementation of the Step Up to Writing program, and development of a "showcase" page for the school web site.

KLS staff members are encouraged to take part in professional development activities outside the district, as well. There is great support for teachers to experience professional development at state and national conferences and meetings. Staff members take and/or teach a variety of graduate-level courses during the school year and over the summer.

Student achievement is high as a direct result of staff professional development. KLS staff members see themselves as learners, and our students know that. When we share what we are learning in our classes and through our own independent studies, students see firsthand how much their teachers value learning.

PART VII: ASSESSMENT RESULTS for KENNY LAKE SCHOOL

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: READING	**Grade**: 1	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**576**	**585**	**587**
Number of students tested	10	7	7
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	6	7	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	588	585	603
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	4	0	2
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	559	--	546
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	5	3	3
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	564	589	568
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	3	5
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	564	530	577
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	55.3	46.9	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	60	44	N/A

Subject: READING	**Grade**: 2	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**622**	**630**	**618**
Number of students tested	10	9	7
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	10	7	6
Caucasian subgroup average score	622	641	617
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	0	2	1
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	--	594	624
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	592	605	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	3	3	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	5	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	632	613	595
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	56.2	61.8	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	62	71	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: READING **Grade**: 3 **Test**: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	38%	20%	43%	50%
% Proficient	62%	60%	57%	50%
% Below Proficient	--	20%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Total # of students tested	8	10	7	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	6	8	7	6
% Advanced	50%	25%	43%	33%
% Proficient	50%	63%	57%	67%
% Below Proficient	--	12%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	2	2	0	2
% Advanced	--	--	--	100%
% Proficient	100%	50%	50%	--
% Below Proficient	--	50%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	3	1	1	0
% Advanced	--	--	--	--
% Proficient	100%	100%	100%	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	5	4	2	1
% Advanced	20%	--	50%	--
% Proficient	80%	50%	50%	100%
% Below Proficient	--	50%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
% Advanced / Proficient	74%	74%	75%	71%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	26%	26%	25%	29%

Subject: READING	**Grade**: 4	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**634**	**656**	**678**
Number of students tested	11	8	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	9	8	6
Caucasian subgroup average score	640	658	684
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	2	0	2
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	607	--	658
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	1	1	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	433	631	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	2	2
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	581	643	686
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	54.5	61.8	69.9
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	58	71	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: READING	**Grade**: 5	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**680**	**685**	**694**
Number of students tested	8	9	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	8	7	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	680	689	709
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	0	2	3
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	--	675	668
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	1	0	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	653	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	2	2	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	687	682	685
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	65.9	69.9	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	77	83	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: READING **Grade**: 6 **Test**: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	67%	73%	83%	83%
% Proficient	33%	18%	17%	--
% Below Proficient	--	9%	--	17%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Total # of students tested	9	11	6	6
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	100%	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	7	7	5	5
% Advanced	71%	100%	80%	80%
% Proficient	29%	--	20%	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	20%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	2	4	1	1
% Advanced	50%	25%	100%	100%
% Proficient	50%	50%	--	--
% Below Proficient	--	25%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	--	--	--	--
% Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	2	5	2	3
% Advanced	--	60%	100%	100%
% Proficient	100%	40%	--	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
% Advanced / Proficient	70%	70%	70%	69%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	30%	30%	30%	31%

Subject: READING	**Grade**: 7	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**712**	**702**	**710**
Number of students tested	11	7	6
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	100%	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	7	6	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	719	701	714
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	4	1	1
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	700	711	691
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	0	1	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	--	675	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	5	2	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	696	711	717
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	74.9	69.9	67
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	88	83	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: READING Grade: 8 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	67%	88%	89%	75%
% Proficient	22%	--	--	25%
% Below Proficient	11%	12%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	11%	--
Total # of students tested	9	8	9	12
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	8	6	5	6
% Advanced	75%	83%	100%	100%
% Proficient	13%	--	--	--
% Below Proficient	12%	17%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	1	2	4	6
% Advanced	--	100%	75%	50%
% Proficient	100%	--	--	50%
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	25%	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	2	0	1	2
% Advanced	50%	--	--	50%
% Proficient	--	--	--	50%
% Below Proficient	50%	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	100%	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	3	4	4	7
% Advanced	67%	100%	100%	86%
% Proficient	33%	--	--	14%
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	68%	68%	82%	82%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	32%	32%	18%	18%

Subject: READING	**Grade**: 9	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**724**	**704**	**699**
Number of students tested	11	13	9
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	9	8	4
Caucasian subgroup average score	718	707	710
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	2	5	5
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	750	699	691
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	0	2	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	--	666	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	6	7	6
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	719	693	706
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	71.4	60.0	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	85	68	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: READING Grade: 10 Test: ALASKA HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION QUALIFYING EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Proficient	87%	90%	70%	75%
% Not Proficient	13%	10%	30%	25%
Total # of students tested	15	10	10	4
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	9	4	7	3
% Proficient	89%	100%	86%	100%
% Not Proficient	11%	--	14%	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	6	6	3	1
% Proficient	83%	83%	33%	--
% Not Proficient	17%	17%	67%	100%
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	2	0	2	0
% Proficient	50%	--	50%	--
% Not Proficient	50%	--	50%	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	8	7	4	0
% Proficient	88%	86%	50%	--
% Not Proficient	12%	14%	50%	--
STATE SCORES:	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
% Proficient	70%	70%	70%	34%
% Not Proficient	30%	30%	30%	66%

Subject: **MATH**	**Grade**: **1**	**Test**: **TERRA NOVA**
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	**March 2002-2003**	**March 2001-2002**
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**529**	**531**	**553**
Number of students tested	10	7	7
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	6	7	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	548	531	571
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	4	0	2
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	501	--	508
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	5	3	3
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	503	517	546
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	3	5
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	542	530	545
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	57.9	43.9	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	65	39	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: **MATH**	**Grade**: **2**	**Test**: **TERRA NOVA**
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	**March 2002-2003**	**March 2001-2002**
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**568**	**576**	**563**
Number of students tested	10	9	7
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	10	7	6
Caucasian subgroup average score	568	584	563
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	0	2	1
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	--	552	563
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	3	3	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	550	563	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	5	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	568	565	532
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	53.3	57.6	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	56	64	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: MATH Grade: 3 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	63%	20%	43%	63%
% Proficient	37%	50%	57%	37%
% Below Proficient	--	20%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	10%	--	--
Total # of students tested	8	10	7	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	6	8	7	6
% Advanced	83%	25%	43%	67%
% Proficient	17%	50%	57%	33%
% Below Proficient	--	13%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	12%	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	2	2	0	2
% Advanced	--	--	--	50%
% Proficient	100%	50%	--	50%
% Below Proficient	--	50%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	3	1	1	0
% Advanced	33%	--	--	--
% Proficient	67%	100%	100%	00
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	5	4	2	1
% Advanced	40%	--	50%	--
% Proficient	60%	25%	50%	100%
% Below Proficient	--	50%	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	25%	--	--
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	72%	72%	71%	66%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	28%	28%	29%	34%

Subject: **MATH**	**Grade**: **4**	**Test**: **TERRA NOVA**
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**627**	**639**	**649**
Number of students tested	11	8	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	9	8	6
Caucasian subgroup average score	629	639	646
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	2	0	2
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	618	--	658
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	1	1	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	561	606	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	2	2
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	603	642	638
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	56.7	57.6	65.6
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	62	64	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: **MATH**	**Grade**: **5**	**Test**: **TERRA NOVA**
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	**March 2002-2003**	**March 2001-2002**
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**671**	**661**	**674**
Number of students tested	8	9	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	8	7	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	671	670	678
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	0	2	3
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	--	668	670
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	1	0	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	617	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	2	2	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	650	659	665
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	59.8	74.3	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	68	88	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: MATH Grade: 6 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	56%	91%	50%	83%
% Proficient	22%	9%	50%	17%
% Below Proficient	22%	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Total # of students tested	9	11	6	6
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	100%	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	7	7	5	5
% Advanced	57%	100%	60%	80%
% Proficient	29%	--	40%	20%
% Below Proficient	14%	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	2	4	1	1
% Advanced	50%	75%	--	100%
% Proficient	--	25%	100%	--
% Below Proficient	50%	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	--	--	--	--
% Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	2	5	2	3
% Advanced	--	80%	--	100%
% Proficient	50%	20%	100%	--
% Below Proficient	50%	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	65%	64%	64%	63%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	35%	36%	36%	37%

Subject: **MATH**	**Grade**: **7**	**Test**: **TERRA NOVA**
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	**March 2002-2003**	**March 2001-2002**
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**713**	**709**	**708**
Number of students tested	11	7	6
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	100%	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	7	6	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	717	709	710
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	4	1	1
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	709	699	701
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	0	1	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	--	699	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	5	2	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	702	706	710
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	72.1	74.3	66.2
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	85	88	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: MATH Grade: 8 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	89%	50%	11%	--
% Proficient	11%	38%	56%	66%
% Below Proficient	--	12%	33%	17%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	17%
Total # of students tested	9	8	9	12
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	8	6	5	6
% Advanced	88%	50%	20%	--
% Proficient	12%	33%	60%	67%
% Below Proficient	--	17%	20%	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	33%
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	1	2	4	6
% Advanced	100%	50%	--	--
% Proficient	--	50%	50%	67%
% Below Proficient	--	--	50%	33%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	2	0	1	2
% Advanced	50%	--	--	--
% Proficient	50%	--	--	50%
% Below Proficient	--	--	100%	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	50%
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	3	4	4	7
% Advanced	100%	50%	--	--
% Proficient	--	25%	75%	71%
% Below Proficient	--	--	25%	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	25%	--	29%
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	64%	64%	40%	39%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	36%	36%	60%	61%

Subject: **MATH**	**Grade**: **9**	**Test**: **TERRA NOVA**
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	**March 2002-2003**	**March 2001-2002**
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**712**	**718**	**718**
Number of students tested	11	14	9
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	9	8	4
Caucasian subgroup average score	711	728	716
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	2	6	5
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	717	704	720
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	0	2	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	--	679	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	6	7	6
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	712	713	713
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	63	58.1	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	81	65	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: MATH Grade: 10 Test: ALASKA HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION QUALIFYING EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Proficient	80%	90%	70%	40%
% Not Proficient	20%	10%	30%	60%
Total # of students tested	15	10	10	5
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	9	4	7	4
% Proficient	100%	100%	86%	50%
% Not Proficient	--	--	14%	50%
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	6	6	3	1
% Proficient	50%	83%	33%	--
% Not Proficient	50%	17%	67%	100%
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	2	0	2	0
% Proficient	50%	--	50%	--
% Not Proficient	50%	--	50%	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	8	7	4	1
% Proficient	88%	86%	50%	100%
% Not Proficient	12%	14%	50%	--
STATE SCORES:	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
% Proficient	67%	70%	64%	44%
% Not Proficient	33%	30%	36%	56%

Subject: LANGUAGE	**Grade**: 1	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*	

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**581**	**585**	**602**
Number of students tested	10	7	7
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	6	7	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	590	585	619
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	4	0	2
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	569	--	557
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	5	3	3
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	571	561	574
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	4	5
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	580	562	594
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	54.9	48.7	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	59	48	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: LANGUAGE	**Grade**: 2	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*	

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**620**	**612**	**605**
Number of students tested	10	9	7
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	620	624	607
Caucasian subgroup average score	10	7	6
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	0	571	596
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	--	2	1
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	3	3	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	594	587	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	5	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	626	604	584
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	57.1	55.9	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	63	61	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: WRITING Grade: 3 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	12%	10%	14%	25%
% Proficient	63%	70%	57%	63%
% Below Proficient	25%	20%	29%	12%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Total # of students tested	8	10	7	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	6	8	7	6
% Advanced	17%	13%	14%	17%
% Proficient	83%	75%	57%	83%
% Below Proficient	--	12%	29%	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	2	2	0	2
% Advanced	--	--	--	50%
% Proficient	--	50%	--	--
% Below Proficient	100%	50%	--	50%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	3	1	1	0
% Advanced	34%	--	--	--
% Proficient	33%	100%	--	--
% Below Proficient	33%	--	100%	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	5	4	2	1
% Advanced	--	--	--	--
% Proficient	60%	50%	50%	100%
% Below Proficient	40%	50%	50%	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	59%	60%	58%	54%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	41%	40%	42%	46%

Subject: LANGUAGE	**Grade**: 4	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**651**	**645**	**667**
Number of students tested	11	8	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	9	8	6
Caucasian subgroup average score	655	645	672
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	2	0	2
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	632	--	651
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	1	1	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	648	623	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	4	2	2
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	623	629	669
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	59.6	58.3	66.3
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	68	65	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: LANGUAGE	**Grade**: 5	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**671**	**681**	**682**
Number of students tested	8	9	8
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	8	7	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	671	684	691
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	0	2	3
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	--	673	682
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	1	0	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	646	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	2	2	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	652	670	667
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	59.8	74.3	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	68	88	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: WRITING Grade: 6 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	78%	45%	83%	83%
% Proficient	22%	55%	17%	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	17%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Total # of students tested	9	11	6	6
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	1	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	100%	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	7	7	5	5
% Advanced	86%	57%	100%	80%
% Proficient	14%	43%	--	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	20%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	2	4	1	1
% Advanced	50%	25%	--	100%
% Proficient	50%	75%	100%	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	0	0	0	0
% Advanced	--	--	--	--
% Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	2	5	2	3
% Advanced	50%	20%	50%	100%
% Proficient	50%	80%	50%	--
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	76%	75%	75%	73%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	24%	25%	25%	27%

Subject: LANGUAGE	**Grade**: 7	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*	

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**704**	**697**	**696**
Number of students tested	11	7	6
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	1	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	100%	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	7	6	5
Caucasian subgroup average score	711	695	698
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	4	1	1
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	692	704	686
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	0	1	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	--	662	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	5	2	3
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	689	699	704
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	68.4	64.7	64.9
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	81	76	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: WRITING Grade: 8 Test: ALASKA BENCHMARK EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Advanced	78%	63%	56%	42%
% Proficient	11%	37%	33%	25%
% Below Proficient	11%	--	11%	33%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Total # of students tested	9	8	9	12
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	8	6	5	6
% Advanced	75%	67%	100%	67%
% Proficient	13%	33%	--	17%
% Below Proficient	12%	--	--	16%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	1	2	4	6
% Advanced	100%	50%	--	17%
% Proficient	--	50%	75%	33%
% Below Proficient	--	--	25%	50%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	2	0	1	2
% Advanced	--	--	75%	--
% Proficient	50%	--	--	--
% Below Proficient	50%	--	25%	100%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	3	4	4	7
% Advanced	100%	75%	25%	43%
% Proficient	--	25%	75%	14%
% Below Proficient	--	--	--	43%
% Far Below Proficient	--	--	--	--
STATE SCORES:	2003-04	2002-03	2001-02	2000-01
% Advanced / Proficient	76%	74%	66%	68%
% Below Proficient / Far Below Proficient	24%	26%	34%	32%

Subject: LANGUAGE	**Grade**: 9	**Test**: TERRA NOVA
Second Edition	Publisher: CTB McGraw-Hill	Scores reported as: *Scaled Scores*

	February 2003-2004	March 2002-2003	March 2001-2002
SCHOOL Average Total Score for grade / test	**709**	**693**	**702**
Number of students tested	11	13	9
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--
Caucasian: # in subgroup	9	8	4
Caucasian subgroup average score	703	702	707
Native Alaskan: # in subgroup	2	5	5
Native Alaskan subgroup average score	736	680	694
Students w/ Disabilities: # in subgroup	0	2	0
Students w/ Disabilities subgroup average score	--	661	--
Economically Disadvantaged: # in subgroup	6	7	6
Economically Disadvantaged subgroup average score	724	687	705
	2003-2004	**2002-2003**	**2001-2002**
MEAN NORMAL CURVE EQUIVALENT (MNCE)	67.6	57.8	N/A
NATIONAL PERCENTILE OF THE MNCE	80	64	N/A

*Please note that every attempt was made to secure nation mean scores and national standard deviations for the TerraNova. However, nearly a dozen phone conversations with district and state testing personnel and attempts to contact CTB McGraw-Hill were unable to secure this information. Thus, school and subgroup averages are reported as scaled scores (as they are reported within our district); MNCE and NP of the MNCE are cited as anchor data.

Subject: WRITING Grade: 10 Test: ALASKA HIGH SCHOOL GRADUATION QUALIFYING EXAM				
TESTING MONTH: APRIL	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
SCHOOL SCORES for this grade/test				
% Proficient	100%	100%	78%	75%
% Not Proficient	--	--	22%	25%
Total # of students tested	15	10	9	4
% of total students tested	100%	100%	100%	100%
Number of students alternatively assessed	0	0	0	0
% of students alternatively assessed	--	--	--	--
Caucasian: total # of students tested	9	4	7	3
% Proficient	100%	100%	86%	100%
% Not Proficient	--	--	14%	--
Native Alaskan: total # of students tested	6	6	2	1
% Proficient	100%	100%	50%	--
% Not Proficient	--	--	50%	100%
Students w/ Disabilities: total # of students tested	2	0	2	0
% Proficient	100%	--	50%	--
% Not Proficient	--	--	50%	--
Economically Disadvantaged: total # students tested	8	7	3	0
% Proficient	100%	100%	67%	--
% Not Proficient	--	--	33%	--
STATE SCORES:	**2003-04**	**2002-03**	**2001-02**	**2000-01**
% Proficient	86%	83%	85%	47%
% Not Proficient	14%	17%	15%	53%